



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/820,511	03/29/2001	Don Rutledge Day	AUS920010001US1	5448
35525	7590	12/31/2007		
IBM CORP (YA) C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC P.O. BOX 802333 DALLAS, TX 75380			EXAMINER NGUYEN, MAIKHANH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/31/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/820,511

Applicant(s)

DAY ET AL.

Examiner

Maikhanh Nguyen

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 September 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-9,11-13,15-20 and 22-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-2, 4-9, 11-13, 15-20, and 22-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to Appeal Brief filed 09/10/2007.

Claims 1-2, 4-9, 11-13, 15-20, and 22-26 are presented for examination. Claims 1, 8, 12, 19, 23, and 25 are independent claims.

In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 09/07/2007, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new ground of rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

- a) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,
- (2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below.



DOUG HUTTON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

### Claim Objections

2. Claims 2, 12, and 24 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrase “*the magnified portion*” (claim 2, lines 1-2) should read “*the selected portion of the magnified display*”;
- the phrase “*the magnified portion*” (claim 12, lines 1-2) should read “*the selected portion of the magnified display*”; and
- the phrase “*the magnified portion*” (claim 24, lines 1-2) should read “*the selected portion of the magnified display*”.

Appropriate correction is required.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

*The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.*

Claims 5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- The limitation “*the original first document*” (claim 5, lines 4-5) lacks antecedent basis. Claim 5 has no “*an original first document*” term that defines or supports the given reference; and
- The limitation “*a normal display space for the original first document*” (claim 7, line 3) is indefinite because it is unclear if it is referring to “*a normal display space for the original first document*” recited in claim 5.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

*(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.*

*This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).*

5. Claims 1-2, 4, 12-13, 15, and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lloyd-Jones et al.** (US 7073128, filed 01/ 2001, priority January 31, 2000) in view of **Cline** (US 5721851, filed Feb 24, 1998).

**As to claim 1:**

Lloyd-Jones teaches method for magnifying a portion of a document in a browser on a client (*see the Abstract*), comprising:

- presenting a first document in a first display in the browser on the client (*col. 4, lines 18-50, col. 6, line 61- col. 7, line 8, fig. 4 and associated text*);
- generating a magnified display of the first document in memory at the client (*col. 4, lines 18, col. 5, line 65 - col. 6, line 60, fig. 4 and associated text*);
- displaying in a second display in the browser a selected portion of the magnified display corresponding to a selected portion of the first document (*col. 5, lines 11-64 and col. 6, lines 28-60*).

Lloyd-Jones, however, does not specifically teach “*mapping the selected portion of the magnified display to a display space of the selected portion of the first document; response to receiving a request for an action within the second display; and performing the action with respect to the first document.*”

Cline teaches *mapping the selected portion of the magnified display to a display space of the selected portion of the first document; response to receiving a request for an action within the second display; and performing the action with respect to the first document* (*col. 1, lines 38-54, col. 3, lines 7-57*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Lloyd-Jones with Cline because it would have provided a visual indication as to where active links are located within a document.

**As to claim 2:**

The combination of Lloyd-Jones and Cline teaches retrieving and displaying a second document corresponding to the link in the first display (*Cline; col. 1, lines 38-54 and col. 3, lines 7-57*).

**As to claim 4:**

The combination of Lloyd-Jones and Cline teaches mapping the magnified portion to the first document (*Cline; col. 1, lines 38-54 and col. 3, lines 7-57*).

**As to claims 12, 13, and 15:**

Refer to claims 1, 2, and 4 above. Claims 12, 13, and 15 are the same as claims 1, 2, and 4, except claims 12, 13, and 15 are apparatus claims and claims 12, 13, and 15 are method claims.

**As to claim 23 and 24:**

Refer to claims 1 and 2. Claims 23 and 24 are the same as claims 1 and 2, except claims 23 and 24 are computer program product claims and Claims 1 and 2 are method claims.

6. Claims 5-7 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lloyd-Jones et al.** in view of **Cline as applied to claims 1 and 12 above**, and further in view of **Hama et al.** (US 4751507, issued 06/ 1988).

**As to claim 5:**

The combination of Lloyd-Jones and Cline does not specifically teach “creating the second display, wherein the second display has a magnified display space based on a magnification factor; and populating pixels in the second display to form a magnified display.”

Hama teaches creating the second display, wherein the second display has a magnified display space based on a magnification factor; and populating pixels in the second display to form a magnified display (*see the Abstract and col. 3, lines 3 - col.4, line 65*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hama with Lloyd-Jones as modified by Cline because it would have provided for presenting an entire image with coarse resolution of detail and a selected portion of that image in an enlarged view with fine resolution of detail.



**As to claim 6:**

The combination of Lloyd-Jones and Cline does not specifically teach “for each pixel of the normal display space, populating adjacent pixels based on the magnification factor.”

Hama teaches for each pixel of the normal display space, populating adjacent pixels based on the magnification factor (*see the Abstract and col. 3, lines 3 - col.4, line 65*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hama with Lloyd-Jones as modified by Cline because it would have provided for presenting an entire image with coarse resolution of detail and a selected portion of that image in an enlarged view with fine resolution of detail.

**As to claim 7:**

The combination of Lloyd-Jones and Cline does not specifically teach “mapping a magnified display space for the magnified portion to corresponding pixels in a normal display space for the original document. ”

Hama teaches for each pixel of the normal display space, populating adjacent pixels based on the magnification factor (*see the Abstract and col. 3, lines 3 - col.4, line 65*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hama with Lloyd-Jones as modified by Cline because it

would have provided for presenting an entire image with coarse resolution of detail and a selected portion of that image in an enlarged view with fine resolution of detail.

**As to claims 16-18:**

Refer to the discussion of claims 5-7 above, respectively, for rejections.

7. Claims 8-9, 11, 19-20, 22, and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lloyd-Jones et al.** in view of **Cline** as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of **Szepesvary et al.** (US 2003/0192026, filed 08/09/2001, priority 12/22/2000).

**As to claim 8:**

The rejection of independent claim 1 above is incorporated herein in full. Additionally, claim 8 recites “analyzing a document object model for the first document.”

The combination of Lloyd-Jones and Cline does not specifically teach “*analyzing a document object model for the first document.*”

Szepesvary teaches analyzing a document object model for the first document (*see ¶¶ 0034-0036*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Szepesvary with Lloyd-Jones as modified by Cline because it would have provided for recognizing user interface objects in HTML applications, as well as for creating computer programs that accept HTML Document Model structures as input.

**As to claim 9:**

Refer to the rejection of claim 2 for rejection.

**As to claim 11:**

Lloyd-Jones teaches adjusting attributes of nodes based on a magnification factor (*see the Abstract*).

**As to claim 19:**

It is directed to an apparatus for performing the method of claim 8, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**As to claims 20 and 22:**

Refer to the rejection of claims 2 and 11 above, for rejections.

**As to claim 25 and 26:**

Refer to claims 8 and 9. Claims 25 and 26 are the same as claims 8 and 9, except claims 25 and 26 are computer program product claims and Claims 8 and 9 are method claims.

**Response to Arguments**

8. Applicant's arguments filed 09/10/2007 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

**Conclusion**

99. The prior art made of record, listed on PTO 892 provided to Applicant is considered to have relevancy to the claimed invention. Applicant should review each identified reference carefully before responding to this office action to properly advance the case in light of the prior art.

**Contact information**


10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-

4093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached at (571) 272-4137.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MN

  
**WILLIAM BASHORE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**